Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council
January 26, 2012, 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. | Edmonds City Hall

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees

Recovery Council Members and Alternates	***Representing***
Linda Anderson-Carnahan	Environmental Protection Agency
Elizabeth Babcock	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Josh Baldi	Washington State Department of Ecology
Linda Berry-Maraist	West Sound Watersheds
Scott Brewer	Hood Canal Coordinating Council
Carrie Byron	Environmental Protection Agency
Alan Chapman	Lummi Tribe
Scott Chitwood	Dungeness/Elwha Watershed
Margaret Clancy	Washington Environmental Council
Ken Dahlstedt	Skagit County
Don Davidson	WRIA 8
Chris Ellings	Nisqually Watershed
Richard Fralick	San Juan County Watershed
Tom Kantz	Pierce County
Randy Kinley	Lummi Tribe
Kirk Lakey	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Joan McGilton	WRIA 9
Lloyd Moody	Governor's Salmon Office
Doug Osterman	WRIA 9
Tom Ostrom	Suquamish Tribe
Kathy Peters	West Sound Watershed Council
Scott Powell	Snohomish Watershed
Mike Shelby	Western Washington Agricultural Association
Pat Stevenson	Stillaguamish Tribe
David Troutt	Nisqually Tribe
Tim Walls	Snohomish County
Jacques White	Long Live the Kings
Jean White	WRIA 8
Terry Williams	Tulalip Tribe
Dan Wrye	Puyallup-White Watershed
Observers and Guests	***Representing***
Dan Berneson	Skagit County
Thom H. Johnson	Point No Point Treaty Council
Kathy Minsch	City of Seattle
Kit Rawson	Regional Implementation Technical Team
Roylene Rides at the Door	United States Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service
Ron Shultz	Washington State Conservation Commission

Robin Slate	United States Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service
Staff	
Laura Blackmore	Blackmore Consulting
Treva Coe	Nooksack Tribe
Jeanette Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership
Susan O'Neil	Puget Sound Partnership
Tristan Peter-Contesse	Puget Sound Partnership
Rebecca Ponzio	Puget Sound Partnership
Lynda Ransley	Puget Sound Partnership
Morgan Schneidler	Puget Sound Partnership
Stephanie Thomas	Cascadia Consulting Group
Scott Williamson	Puget Sound Partnership

Opening

Chair David Troutt welcomed Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council (Council) members, guests, and staff, thanked everyone for attending, and asked everyone to introduce themselves. The meeting started shortly after 10:00 a.m. with a review of the agenda. David Troutt introduced and welcomed new Council member Margaret Clancy, from the Washington Environmental Council, and two special guests: Ron Shultz, from Washington State Conservation Commission, and Roylene Rides at the Door, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service. The January 26 meeting agenda was approved. David Troutt shared a story and concluded that the Council works to align systems for recovery and restoration.

Review Meeting Summary

Meeting facilitator Laura Blackmore asked the Council if they had any comments on the December 1 meeting summary. There were no comments, and the meeting summary was approved. Laura Blackmore requested that all attendees sign in.

Vision for Recovery Council

David Troutt summarized that the Executive Committee met to discuss the role of the Council and discuss our responsibility around overseeing implementation of the recovery effort in Puget Sound. David Troutt introduced the provided document that outlined some of the Council's operating procedures and who the Council is. He requested the Council's input on whether the document accurately presents who the Council is and what the Council intends to do.

Comments:

- While looking at what we have accomplished, how do we integrate with the Action Agenda and how do we integrate with strategic initiatives? We need three to five things to concentrate on to get the funding to move forward. It's clear that we need think more about the Council's strategy with the Puget Sound Partnership (the PSP).
- Council member Terry Williams seconded this comment. He noted that the Council should try to track actions that are taking place and that the Council should look at how to apply for funding, inside the process and out, and ways to fill data gaps.
- There should be data gathering to support the plan implementation and update.

- Council member Scott Powell asked what is in the Recovery Plan. Rather than identifying the 4 H's (habitat, hydropower, hatcheries, and harvest), the Council needs to develop a clear statement as to how this group came together and what keeps us here.
- Council member Randy Kinley stated that, from a tribal perspective, they are considering moving the Council out of the PSP process, and they want to hear the Council's thoughts. It was recognized that the PSP is struggling. Randy Kinley requested that the Council think about where the tribes are coming from; they don't want to alienate the Council.
- A Council member stated that they thought that the PSP has done a good job of bringing local government to the table. What are the thoughts behind removing the Council from the PSP?
    - Randy Kinley answered this question.
        - The tribal leaders see that their treaty rights are being consumed by a process that is controlled by the State.
        - The habitat is degrading faster than we're recovering it. The tribes are not seeing any action to stop this. We have science available to take action, but no political will to do it.
        - Hatcheries and Harvest are being looked at, but not Habitat.
        - This has driven tribes to meet with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and many other entities.
    - David Troutt noted that the tribes are concerned about the promise that the PSP would hold others accountable and drive things to get done. There is frustration among the tribal community that this hasn't happened. David Troutt believes that results can be delivered by the PSP and the Council.
- Vice-chair Don Davidson stated that he tends to agree. With spending six years preparing to do plans, we're losing some of our focus on salmon and building focus on cleaning up Puget Sound. The PSP is behind the Council regarding the current level of readiness. Should we join them again once they have reached our level of readiness? There are concerns about groups at the local level and losing these representatives if we lose momentum.

    Terry Williams noted that during the last time they met with federal agencies, Will Stelle of NOAA Fisheries said the federal agencies are trying to come together. He noted that the federal agencies have already delegated programs to the state and local governments and cannot withdraw easily. Now that programs have been delegated and laws have been created, the federal agencies would like to see those laws implemented. We need another path if it this current structure doesn't work, and we are working with a timeline regarding climate impacts.
- For the tribes, the intent is not to harm the process. How do we get everyone working for the same goal?
- Council member Elizabeth Babcock stated that this was a fair discussion from Randy Kinley. She has been here since the beginning of process, and many organizations don't have the type of broad representation that this Council has. What is powerful about this group is the broad representation and the ability to achieve common solutions. With the old model, where NOAA worked with the tribes, one entity at a time, it was found to be slow and inefficient. The feeling is that this group has not been used to its highest purpose and ability. The Executive Committee has been discussing how to make it more effective. There is big advantage to stay together. If we show our commitment, we will satisfy what the Tribes have brought to the table and reach our outcomes.
- Ron Shultz said it's not a question of whether or not we should have this structure. We should have it. The question is what is active and effective? We need to have focus and accountability.
- Council member Scott Powell is sympathetic to the work not being fast enough and that the PSP could function better. He wanted to reiterate that this is one ecosystem and that there is overlap between Puget Sound and salmon recovery.
- Council member Alan Chapman said that this group was charged with implementing the Salmon Recovery Plan, and the idea is to make this group where actions happen. We want to come out with vigorous discussion and resolve issues at these meetings.

- Council member Josh Baldi noted that this group serves to advise the PSP and Recovery Plans. Rearranging the organizational structure is scary. The habitat initiative, not just about Chinook, should speak to other species and treaty rights at risk. In 2012 and the Action Agenda update, we can drive the actions that were discussed today.
- David Troutt stated that it doesn't matter who is the lead, whether it be NOAA or the PSP. It is up to us if we want to be here.
- Don Davidson said he has concerns about why salmon actions are not reflected in results and how they are working together.

Laura Blackmore then asked the Council for any questions about the "Authority" section of the document.

- Terry Williams noted that it might be beneficial to meet with the federal agencies and ask why we are not connecting. The federal agencies trying to be nationally consistent but also good to make site-specific decisions, regardless of what the rest of the nation is doing.
- Laura Blackmore asked how the Council could knit the threads of federal and state work together and fill in any gaps.
- Alan Chapman noted that this is the only group within Puget Sound that has representation, and it doesn't need to invite federal agencies. They're here and discussion can be held here. Reference the Shared Strategy. Our authority comes from the facts that the Council developed the Recovery Plan, the original mission was salmon recovery, and that we have everyone here.
- Regarding the topic about how funds are allocated, the PSP staff member Rebecca Ponzio noted that the PSP defines the allocation. This should be in writing from a Leadership Council meeting. Refer to the formal charter, from a meeting in Bremerton in 2007, which outlines authority.
- The point was made that if we divorce, the Council could have less authority, less resources, and less ability to do what the Council wants to do.
- Elizabeth Babcock said the Council should not spend time on gaining authority and asking for permission.

Laura Blackmore transitioned to reviewing the "Structure" section of the document about the Council's role. The list in this section of the document describes the resources available to the Council.

Questions/Comments:

- Council member Jean White suggested that the facilitation contract be added to the list of roles.
- Randy Kinley suggested that the last bullet be expanded to include state agencies. Alan Chapman added that the local agencies also be added.
- Habitat should also be added, and that all of the Recovery Council members offer support.
- Terry Williams said that we want to have the same dialogue with the timber industry. The hydrology has changed. Ecology needs to think about how to measure the types of actions that we take to slow down the flow. We should renew efforts to get the Washington Forestry Protection Association (WFPA) here. The WFPA is a Council member.

The discussion then moved to the "Potential 2012 Work Plan" section of the document.

Questions/Comments:

- The Millie Judge report offered high-level reviews of habitat loss, but we want to focus on the three to five items in front of each area. What about the Snohomish, Nisqually, and other local areas?
- We want to understand where we are as a region and challenges around implementation.
- We want to develop actions that make sense in order for everyone to be successful.
- The Executive Committee will give a presentation to the Council about how they think the group should move forward.

- Terry Williams asked how watersheds could tell stories and describe differences between watersheds. An intern had helped them in the past with analysis on the Nisqually, Snohomish, and Skagit. We could use this intern's thinking and structure and develop a chapter for each watershed, which could create a better understanding of goals and how we get there.
- Council member Pat Stevenson said that every year, watersheds update three-year work plans and send them to the Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT). These resources should contain a long history of barriers of implementation from the past four to five years.
- Scott Powell recommended adding a variation of "support watershed leads program" to the third goal, "Revitalize the Recovery Council." He called for integrating more thoroughly with the Action Agenda and the PSP. He also suggested guiding development of the action plan for Monitoring & Adaptive Management Framework by working with the RITT and scientists.
- Council member Doug Osterman stated that we want to consider our goal. Make a clear goal that shows us as a PSP Action Agenda strategic initiative. Implementation of the salmon recovery plan in Puget Sound is a strategic initiative of the PSP. A task can be added that says "Immediately submit comments that cement our actions to recover salmon as a priority for Puget Sound Action Agenda implementation."
- Show that we are a priority for cleaning up Puget Sound. The plan does not need to be held up if we don't know what other priorities are. Is Puget Sound recovery also salmon recovery?
- Jean White stated that watershed restoration is also needed, in addition to habitat protection. Focus efforts on strategic initiatives and make sure the Salmon chapter states near-term actions that we have agreed upon.
- Josh Baldi wants to be clear that the Council is giving the habitat initiative lots of energy by stating "Ensure salmon and other species recovery is clearly addressed and significantly advanced through the Action Agenda habitat initiative."
- Randy Kinley said that we should look at what has been accomplished and what has failed. The Council should send the PSP a letter. Dan Wrye supports a letter from the Council about the Action Agenda.
- Council member Jacques White said that the RITT's framework won't be ready to provide the level the Council wants by this summer. We could mature and do a better job as more tools become available.
- Doug Osterman said that in the comment letter to the PSP about the Action Agenda, topics would involve cementing our actions to recover salmon as a priority in the Action Agenda implementation. We need to state that we are ready to go. The bottom line is that endangered species need customized plans.

Laura Blackmore will write a letter, on behalf on the Council, to the PSP, asking it to include implementation of the Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan as a strategic initiative. Jeanette Dorner said that the Council needs to choose for itself regarding how it wants to operate.

Further comments:

- Terry Williams asked how we collect data on marine and fresh water. The salmon and shellfish nutrient timing and carbon levels should be looked at. With the help of resources from the University of Colorado, historical data were considered. A sequestration project, with the University of Washington also helped. We need data and to know that we are on track.
- It was recognized that the work that Terry Williams explained may need up to two separate initiatives.
- The Millie Judge report does offer some watershed data in the appendix, which could be used as a starting point.
- Every tribe can update their statuses of recovery implementation and health of runs and tell stories. This would be a good opportunity to double-check information with the Millie Judge report.

Jeanette Dorner asked the Council if the right actions are stated in the Action Agenda. She told the Council to make comments and send them to the Council so that the PSP can support them. The actions in the Agenda also need to be prioritized. With the Executive Committee, there is a way for the Recovery Council to weigh in. Jeanette Dorner outlined the following three ways that the Recovery Council can be involved:

1. In order to prioritize actions, draft criteria have already been developed and published in the draft Action Agenda. Please submit comments on them by February 3.
2. The Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) subcommittee will look at the finalized criteria after February 3 and develop weights for the criteria. The Council has been invited to attend the ECB subcommittee. Recovery Council members who are also ECB members may meet ahead of the ECB meeting to discuss an approach.
    a. Simultaneously, the ECB will make a survey available to help gather information to help them apply the criteria to near-term actions. Individual Council members can take the survey. Plan for spending a couple of hours in February.
3. Once the prioritized list of Near-Term Actions is created, the Council and ECB will examine the results. Depending on the timing, the Council will do this work either at the March 22 meeting or at a special meeting.

Questions/Comments:

- Regarding the letter to the PSP, does protection include restoration? The suggestion was that habitat protection should its own item, rather than part of another topic.
- Council member Jacques White stated that habitat protection is more than restoration. One Council member heard the strength that there are opportunities to provide funds for restoration work. Protection will be the activity that requires new resources, and the Council does not have authority to delegate those funds. We should think about our restrictions of money and how the PSP is appropriating money and if those priorities align.
- Council member Scott Brewer asked what is the habitat initiative?
    - Jeanette Dorner said that there are three strategic initiatives that are highlighted within the Action Agenda. There is one initiative on shellfish, one on storm water runoff, and one on habitat protection.
    - Josh Baldi stated that during the last ECB meeting it was proposed that a collection of strategic initiatives be developed. It is a combination of strategic focus, selling the action agenda, and getting energy. This is all under development and shaped in real time. There is an advantage for us to claim space and drive it. The habitat initiative needs to be shaped.
- Regarding Task #5 in the Role of Council document, Don Davidson said that this task is harder than restoring habitat. When dealing with property, one also works with the courts. This protection tends to go more slowly in urban lands.
- Terry Williams said that we cannot always rely on grants. How do we align business and industry leaders to be connected?
- It is good to look at who's in your watershed and ask who will benefit from being part of the recovery.
- Doug Osterman suggested that the local level be added to Task #5. Add "land use and local government actions" under Task #2.
- Randy Kinley said that March may be too far away. He stated that we should assess timing and decide the best way to do this in terms of how and when to address this topic.
- Alan Chapman said that we should have a report card, which will help us to evaluate the changes that have occurred.

At this point, the Council recessed for a lunch break.

Laura Blackmore welcomed everyone back from lunch and summarized information that was introduced before lunch. Before February 3, a letter will be sent to the PSP stating that the salmon recovery plan must be a strategic initiative, whether it is separate or included with another initiative. Everyone can be included on the process of reviewing the draft Action Agenda, including the draft criteria for prioritization, and this must be done before February 3. A meeting will be scheduled before the ECB prioritization workshop with ECB members to discuss plans for meeting, and another one can be scheduled afterwards to discuss thoughts. After this meeting, a survey

will be distributed that will help the ECB to determine how they use the criteria. The ECB will vet the final list of results after the model is done. The Council can also vet the list.

Laura Blackmore summarized additional discussion items:

- Have the watersheds tell stories.
- Tribes have looked at status. Consider the appendix in Millie Judge's report.
- Use the three-year Work Plan updates to create progress reports and the Obstacles Report.
- Connect and align with business and industry regarding recovery.
- There will be a meeting in July to hear about each watershed's progress toward implementation. There are two more meetings between now and then (March and May) to finalize our approach to this effort.

Laura Blackmore reviewed the handout that contains the meeting calendar for 2012. During the week of February 6, interested Council members will meet and prepare for the ECB meeting, which will be held on February 16. David Troutt can attend the Leadership Council meeting on February 29 if necessary to explain our views. The Status of Implementation work is a Recovery Council Initiative and can be pulled together at the Council's July 26 meeting and can report on it during the Leadership Council Meeting held on August 23 and 24.

Laura Blackmore introduced the proposal to create an Executive Committee and referred to the provided handout. Logistically, the PSP will support this committee, and it will meet a week after the Council meeting to discuss the general the Council meeting and next steps.

Comments:

- Scott Powell requested that "local government" be added to the "Proposed Membership" list.
- Terry Williams suggested that the PSP, not the Council, works with Local Integrating Organizations (LIOs). The role of the Recovery Council is to reach out to LIOs.
- Don Davidson expressed concern that the Executive Committee would become primary and that the Council members would no longer attend the general meetings.
- Laura Blackmore noted that each caucus may pick which members they would like to join the Executive Committee. She will send an e-mail regarding the deadline for choosing Executive Committee members.

Jacques White moved this motion. Joan McGilton, Elizabeth Babcock, and Terry Williams all seconded.

Council member Richard Fralick remembered that in December, we were hearing the same story and that there was no traction. He has a different view of a work plan. We should include a metric and determine goals. The plan should be completed by the end of this year and be focused on 2013. Regarding Terry Williams' suggestion of finding goals and constructing a flow chart, when do we do this? David Troutt replied by saying that we will do this now that we have the Council's approval on this overall approach.

Monitoring & Adaptive Management Framework

Kit Rawson, Chair of the RITT, presented slides regarding a Monitoring & Adaptive Framework. He said that they will be working with each watershed to develop a common framework. Every watershed needs to participate. This will fill the gaps within the adaptive management plan. We will need to have goals in each place within the plan and will need common currency. The plan asks you to look at where, why, and how something didn't work. It will improve the decision-making process.

Comments:

- Dan Wrye noted that developing such a framework will not make up for a lack of discipline and management oversight.
- Jacques White stated that we have made much progress on this framework. He is an advocate of the plan.

PSP staff member Rebecca Ponzio followed Kit Rawson's presentation by answering the questions of how the Council can engage in this work. She summarized these roles of the Recovery Council:

1. The Recovery Council will support the RITT, through resources and capacity. The RITT and watersheds have limited budgets, so they need support in the areas of time and money.
2. The Recovery Council will keep the story and conversation alive, by defining why we work on this. This takes time and resources and will involve thinking over a long timeframe.
3. The Recovery Council will track the outcomes. The data will be folded into a common framework. This is a forum to track progress. People will be held accountable for information that is made available.
4. The Recovery Council will bring people to the table and keep them here, such as watersheds.
5. The next step will be to answer the question of how the Council makes policy decisions. This will be discussed in March with the Work Plan.

Questions/Comments:

- David Troutt noted that it would be up to the watersheds if we want to use these plans. Are watersheds prepared to adopt an adaptive management plan?
- Scott Powell said that other groups, such as NOAA and Snohomish, have their own programs, perspective, and tools. David Troutt confirmed that the intent of this new framework is not to bring conflict with tools already in place. Kit Rawson confirmed that they have had a relationship with all groups while preparing this framework and have integrated tools already in place. Elizabeth Babcock said that the RITT has done a great job at making sure other tools and systems were accounted for while developing this framework.
- Doug Osterman asked whether all watersheds adopt and who is ultimately responsible for implementing this framework. We will want to have a conversation with management to discuss the cost and structure of implementing a framework. Everyone will want to know what it means for their organization before it is adopted. Will the watersheds be sued if they do not the PSP standards within the plan? Who will handle the policy side of the framework?
- How do the watersheds integrate this plan with other monitoring groups and programs?
- How do we make this useful for policy makers? We will want to prioritize key actions.
- We will need to maintain integrity of information.
- Don Davidson asked if the RITT is creating a framework for each watershed or one common framework. A common framework will be created, and communication will be shared among watersheds. For the monitoring component, the right data will need to be monitored.
- Terry Williams asked how we set priorities and achieve them. Snohomish is already forming a group. We have to sit down collectively, consider realistic goals, and examine accountability around what we can or can't do for each watershed.
- Josh Baldi warned that we will want to be careful of the utility of the tool and take caution. What are the key actions that we should be tracking to make sure we have been making progress?
- Kit Rawson said that this framework was developed by looking at the watershed plans as they exist.
- Terry Williams said they need to get public opinion. Counties are developing land and issuing permits, so maybe this isn't the right route.
- Don Davidson finds value in quantifying the merits of actions. We need to look at cost, assumptions, and data entry work. Having a common currency is a good thing. He is an advocate of this.

Laura Blackmore concluded that this will be discussed further in March and that the current plan will continue to be populated, and we will consider how the Council can support it. The RITT is also looking for three new scientists to join their staff. David Troutt said that we need more people to help populate the model.

Recommendations from Steelhead Subcommittee

PSP staff member Tristan Peter-Contesse provided an update on the work of the Steelhead Subcommittee. Steelhead were listed as threatened in Puget Sound in 2007. There is no recovery plan developed yet, but there are some technical components under development such as:

- The Steelhead Technical Recovery Team (TRT) released a draft population identification report for Puget Sound Steelhead. It divided the Puget Sound region into three major populations, which contained 32 individual populations. This research will lead to the viability criteria report, which will inform recovery goal-setting. This report should be available in March for comment.
- NOAA hired a post-doc to create a life cycle model for Puget Sound Steelhead and the Lower Columbia.

The Steelhead Committee asked that the Council approve their general approach to allocating the $250,000 in Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) funding to help identify watershed-scale strategies and actions to recover steelhead. The first page of a memo titled "Steelhead Recovery Planning Status and Proposed Next Steps" highlights the recommendation and the remainder provides more detail.

- We want to continue the line of research regarding marine survival, for steelhead and other species; we need a larger life cycle limiting factors level analysis for Puget Sound; and we are proposing a regional-level report that incorporates a gap analysis to show where recovery plans for Chinook and summer chum do not incorporate the needs for steelhead and habitat of steelhead as effectively as they could, and a limiting factors analysis.
- We are refining intrinsic potential modeling that was in the Steelhead Foundations project, and bringing it down to a finer scale.
- We are also proposing that some of the SRFB funding can be allocated to support lead entities to submit their information and be part of this process.
- SRFB funding proposal ($250,000 total) includes $50,000 to marine survival; $100,000 to gap analysis; and $98,000 to lead entities.

Questions/Comments:

- Kathy Peters said that there are early action items that we can get started with. West Sound needs spawning ground surveys and could use this $7k for this work.
- Terry Williams said that after the $250,000 is used, we should know what the problems are and what we can do to counter them.
- Regarding the $250,000, Don Davidson said that the resources are scarce.
- Kirk Lakey said that there is some basic information that watersheds do not know about their fish. Is marine survival where we want to put the money?
- David Troutt said that the funds are meant to lead recovery plans, not necessarily spawning ground counts.
- Thom Johnson said that there is a data gap with marine survival.
- Jacques White said that we will want to review the cost of the recovery plan and prioritize steps. He recommended that we look at other resources in order to finish our work.
- The watersheds will do overlap analysis. For example, some of what we know for Chinook, we also know for steelhead.
- We can put this in the context of a Recovery Plan effort with NOAA's recovery plan for steelhead.
- Is this work that is required for the recovery plan? What part of the Recovery Plan does this satisfy?
- Will the marine-survival work be focused on steelhead or will it have a multi-species focus? It will identify causes of poor marine survival that affect all salmonid species.
- All money should be placed in the development of the Recovery Plan or in early actions regarding steelhead.

- Money will be put towards the development of the Recovery Plan, and lead entities do not need to take the $7,000 if they do not need it.
- Scott Powell noted that $7,000 is not enough money to justify the time spent on altering his Lead Entity contract.
- What were historical conditions and impediments? Were limiting factors already done? How do Steelhead reports, already completed, connect with this work?
- Elizabeth Babcock said that there is no deadline for the Recovery Plan. Answering the question as to whether NOAA should write it independently or with the Council is in progress.
- Tom Johnson said that the goal was to get a region-wide application using the funds. There is a need for information and capacity, regarding the engagement of watersheds.
- Jacques White noted the Council may want to determine to cost of doing a Recovery Plan and prioritize tasks to accomplish that. We could see other resources to get this work done. He suggested also that the watersheds look at their Chinook recovery plans and think about what actions could also work for steelhead.
- Elizabeth Babcock said that NOAA would like to work with the Council to develop the steelhead action plan.
- Tristan Peter-Contesse said that they sent a set of questions to watershed coordinators regarding data gaps and barriers. From the watershed lead meetings, there is also discussion about lead entities and their commitments to carry pieces forward.
- Randy Kinley noted that we cannot lose our focus on the Chinook and multi-species effort. We need to stay focused.
- NOAA plans to send the designation of critical habitat to Washington, D.C., by March or early April.
- The SRFB will need our proposal of how to use funds by April. People can review the Foundations report before the March the Council meeting for more background. NOAA will also send a crosswalk between Recovery Plan guidelines and the Foundations report. The Steelhead Subcommittee will continue refining its recommendation based on this discussion and will return in March with a proposal.

Update on Habitat Action Plan Progress

Federal Caucus

Elizabeth Babcock said that NOAA is on point to coordinate the action plan with agencies and it will go to CEQ at the end of February. The co-chairs are Will Stelle, Dennis McLerran, and Roylene Rides at the Door. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the lead for coordinating a matrix of activities and commitments for federal agencies. NOAA will populate this matrix when it is done. The three actions are shoreline protection, floodplain connectivity, and water quality.

The vision is that CEQ will receive the general action plan, with specific initiatives among agencies and specific agency-to-agency contributions.

Guest Roylene Rides at the Door stated that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) requested $10 million in funding for this year and could anticipate receiving $4 to 5 million. She is looking at how she can fit the contract with this action plan and to work together with the Council by a May deadline. USDA could work with the Army Corps of Engineers and their Endangered Species Act and realty specialists to use some of their watershed data and make this process go faster. The timeframe for the funding is one year. USDA hopes to have these details for the 2013 budget.

Questions/Comments:

- Can this contract be signed with the PSP?

- Roylene Rides at the Door said that the contract cannot go to one individual, and the projects must be ready to start. With a couple of exceptions, there is a $350,000 payment limit to each individual entity. Our programs are not grant programs.
- Jeanette Dorner extended the offer to let the PSP and the Council know how they can help.

State Caucus
Jeanette Dorner will review with state agencies to make sure they captured everything. When the federal agencies list is done, the state agencies will be ready to integrate with it. The state agencies will use the Council to bring the threads together. They are anticipating a longer timeline than what was originally planned.

Legislative & Director's Report

Jeanette Dorner opened her report by sharing a story and her reflections about her time recently spent outside of the country. She noticed that as we are having intense conversations within our groups, similar conversations are occurring all over the world as well. Jeanette Dorner also announced that the PSP has one job opening for an Ecosystem Coordinator. She requested that the Council share this opening with anyone that they think would be a good fit.

PSP staff member Michael Grayum developed the legislative document that was provided during this meeting. The Council should be more involved instead of receiving updates. Michael Grayum welcomed r Council members to visit Olympia to testify. Jeanette clarified that the Recovery Council can take any position on any legislation it likes, and staff will communicate that position to state agencies or the Governor.

Comments:
- David Troutt requested that we also receive notice of bills that could have negative consequences, and he asked if staff could be critical of government/agency requests. Ron Shultz added that it would unfair to ask Ecology, the PSP, or other staff to criticize governor-request legislation.
- Council member Margaret Clancy stated that the Washington Environmental Council (WEC) also issues a weekly "watch list" e-mail that covers bills that affect water quality and related topics. It also provides the WEC's position on certain bills.

Wrap up & Adjourn

Laura Blackmore concluded this meeting and David Troutt shared a story and said that he thought the Council made progress during the meeting. The next meeting will be on March 22. The next steps include:
- A letter will be sent to the PSP, on behalf of the Council, that states that implementing the salmon recovery plan needs to be a strategic initiative of the Action Agenda.
- Send in comments about adding weights to prioritize near-term actions by February 3.

Subsequent meetings will be as follows. All meetings begin at 10:00 a.m. at Edmonds City Hall unless otherwise specified:
- March 22, 2012
- May 24
- July 26
- September 27
- November 29